arXiv:math/0203150v1 [math.AG] 15 Mar 2002

THE GRADIENT OF A POLYNOMIAL AT INFINITY

JACEK CHĄDZYŃSKI AND TADEUSZ KRASIŃSKI

ABSTRACT. We give a full description of the growth of the gradient of a polynomial in two complex variables at infinity near any fiber of the polynomial.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ be a non-constant polynomial and let $\nabla f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ be its gradient. There exists a finite set $B(f) \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that f is a locally trivial C^∞-bundle over $\mathbb{C} \setminus B(f)$. The set $B(f)$ is the union of the set of critical values $C(f)$ of f and critical values $\Lambda(f)$ corresponding to the singularities of f at infinity. The set $\Lambda(f)$ is defined to be the set of all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ for which there are no neighbourhood U of λ and a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $f : f^{-1}(U) \setminus K \to U$ is a trivial C^∞-bundle. It is known that the set $\Lambda(f)$ is finite ([Ph], Appendix A1, [V], Corollary 5.1). It turns out that for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ the property of being in $\Lambda(f)$ depends on the behaviour of the gradient ∇f near the fiber $f^{-1}(\lambda)$.

Ha in [H2] defined the notion of the Łojasiewicz exponent $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ of the gradient ∇f at infinity near a fibre $f^{-1}(\lambda_0)$ in the following way

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) := \lim_{\delta \to 0^+} \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(D_\delta)), \tag{1.1}$$

where $D_\delta := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \delta\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(D_\delta))$ is the Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity of the mapping ∇f on the set $f^{-1}(D_\delta)$ (see the definition in Section 3) and gave, without a proof, a characterization of $\Lambda(f)$ for $n = 2$ in terms of $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$. Namely, $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(f)$ if and only if $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < 0$ (or equivalently $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < -1$). A generalization of this result was given by Parusiński in [P]. Moreover, Ha also gave a formula for $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ in terms of Puiseux expansions of roots of the polynomial $f - \lambda_0$ at infinity for $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(f)$ (this formula is analogous to the formula for the local Łojasiewicz exponent of the gradient ∇f, given in [KL]).

The aim of this paper is to give in the case $n = 2$ a complete description of the behaviour of the gradient ∇f near any fibre $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. To achieve this we define a more convenient Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity of ∇f near a fibre $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ (it will turns out in Section 5 to be equivalent to the above one) as the infimum of the Łojasiewicz exponents at infinity of ∇f on meromorphic curves "approximating" $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ at infinity. Precisely, for a non-constant polynomial $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ we define $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) := \inf_{\Phi} \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi}, \tag{1.2}$$

Date: March 15, 2002.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32S99; Secondary 14R99.

Key words and phrases. Łojasiewicz exponent, gradient of a polynomial, singularity at infinity.

This research was partially supported by KBN Grant No 2 P03A 007 18.

where $\Phi = (\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_n)$ is a meromorphic mapping defined in a neighbourhood of ∞ in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ such that $\deg \Phi > 0$ and $\deg(f-\lambda)\circ\Phi < 0$. Here $\deg \Phi := \max(\deg \varphi_1, ..., \deg \varphi_n)$. We shall also call such mappings meromorphic curves.

The main results of the paper are effective formulas for $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and properties of the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ for $n = 2$. To describe them we outline the contents of the sections.

Section 2 has an auxiliary character and contains technical results on relations between roots of a polynomial and its derivatives.

In Section 3 we investigate $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda(f)$. In particular we obtain the all results of Ha with full proofs.

The main theorems are given in Section 4. They are Theorems 4.1, 4.4 and 4.5 which give effective formulas for $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ in terms of the resultant $\mathrm{Res}_y(f(x,y) - \lambda, f'_y(x,y) - u)$, where λ, u are new variables and (x, y) is a generic system of coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^2$. As a consequence we obtain (Theorem 4.6) a basic property of the function $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = const. \geqslant 0 \quad \text{for } \lambda \notin \Lambda(f), \\ &\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \in [-\infty, -1) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \Lambda(f) \end{aligned}$$

Technical problems in proofs of Theorems 4.4 and 4.5 are caused by the fact that the exponent $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ does not have to be attained on a meromorphic curve i.e. it may happen that there is no meromorphic curve Φ such that $\deg \Phi > 0$, $\deg(f-\lambda)\circ\Phi < 0$ and

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi}.$$

At the end of this section we compare the functions $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ and $\lambda \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(\lambda))$ (Theorem 4.8). It turns out they differ only in a finite set of points, containing $\Lambda(f)$.

In Section 5 we show the equivalence (only in case $n = 2$) of the two above notions of the Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity of ∇f near a fibre $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ i.e. the equality

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{1.3}$$

In Section 6 some partial results on $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ in n dimensional case are given. Here a complete characterization (in terms of the exponents $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$) of the values of f for which the Malgrange condition does not hold is given. Some open problems on $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ are also posed.

In the end we explain some technical assumptions occured in Sections 2-5. Since one can easily show that the exponent $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ does not depend on linear change of coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n$ we shall assume in Sections 2-5 that the polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ is monic with respect to y and $\deg f = \deg_y f$. Then we have a simple characterization of the set $\Lambda(f)$ which will be used in the paper. Namely, in [H1] and [K] there was proved that

$$\Lambda(f) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : c_0(\lambda) = 0\}, \tag{1.4}$$

where the polynomial $c_0(\lambda)x^N + \cdots + c_N(\lambda)$ is the resultant of the polynomials $f(x, y) - \lambda$, $f'_y(x, y)$ with respect to the variable y.

2. Auxiliary results

Let f be a non-constant polynomial in two complex variables of the form

$$f(x,y)=y^n+a_1(x)y^{n-1}+\cdots+a_n(x),\quad \deg a_i\leqslant i,\quad i=1,...,n. \tag{2.1}$$

It can be easily showed (see [CK1]).

Lemma 2.1. *If $n>1$, then for every $\lambda_0\in\mathbb{C}$ there exist an $D\in\mathbb{N}$ and functions $\beta_1,...,\beta_n$, $\gamma_1,...,\gamma_{n-1}$, meromorphic at infinity, such that*

(a) $\deg\beta_i\leqslant D$, $\deg\gamma_j\leqslant D$,
(b) $f(t^D,y)-\lambda_0=\prod_{i=1}^n(y-\beta_i(t))$,
(c) $f'_y(t^D,y)=n\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}(y-\gamma_j(t))$.

$\square$

We shall now give a lemma which directly follows from the property B.3 in [GP]. Local version of this lemma was proved in [KL].

Lemma 2.2. *([GP], B.3) Under notation and assumptions of Lemma 2.1 for every $i,j\in\{1,...,n\}$, $i\neq j$, there exists $k\in\{1,...,n-1\}$ such that*

$$\deg(\beta_i-\beta_j)=\deg(\beta_i-\gamma_k) \tag{2.2}$$

and inversly for every $i\in\{1,...,n\}$ and $k\in\{1,...,n-1\}$ there exists $j\in\{1,...,n\}$ such that (2.2) holds.

$\square$

Now we prove a proposition useful in the sequel. A local version of it is given in [P2] and [Ro]. We put $\Psi_l(t):=(t^D,\gamma_l(t))$, $l\in\{1,...,n-1\}$.

Proposition 2.3. *Under notations and assumptions of Lemma 2.1 we have*

$$\min_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n}\deg\left(\beta_i-\beta_j\right)+\min_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n}\deg(\beta_i-\beta_j)\right)=\min_{l=1}^{n-1}(\deg\left(f-\lambda_0\right)\circ\Psi_l). \tag{2.3}$$

Proof. (after [Ro]). There exists $i_0\in\{1,...,n\}$ such that the left hand side in (2.3) is equal to

$$\sum_{j=1,j\neq i_0}^{n}\deg\left(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_j\right)+\min_{j=1,j\neq i_0}^{n}\deg(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_j)$$

and $j_0\in\{1,...,n\}$ such that

$$\min_{j=1,j\neq i_0}^{n}\deg(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_j)=\deg(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_{j_0}). \tag{2.4}$$

By Lemma 2.2 there exists $k_0\in\{1,...,n-1\}$

$$\deg(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_{j_0})=\deg(\beta_{i_0}-\gamma_{k_0}). \tag{2.5}$$

We shall lead the further part of the proof in four steps.

A. We first show that for each $j\in\{1,...,n\}$ we have

$$\deg(\gamma_{k_0}-\beta_j)\geqslant\deg(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_{j_0}). \tag{2.6}$$

Take any $j\in\{1,...,n\}$ and consider two cases:

(a) $\deg(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_{j_0})\leqslant\min_{s=1, s\neq j}^{n}\deg(\beta_s-\beta_j)$,

(b) $\deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_{j_0}) > \min_{\substack{s=1\\ s\neq j}}^{n} \deg(\beta_s - \beta_j)$.

In case (a) by Lemma 2.2 there exists $p \in \{1, ..., n\}$ such that

$$\deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j) = \deg(\beta_p - \beta_j) \geqslant \min_{\substack{s=1\\ s\neq j}}^{n} \deg(\beta_s - \beta_j) \geqslant \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_{j_0}).$$

which gives (2.6).

In case (b) by definition of i_0 and (2.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{s=1, s\neq i_0}^{n} \deg\,(\beta_s - \beta_{i_0}) + \deg(\beta_{j_0} - \beta_{i_0})\\ &\leqslant \sum_{s=1, s\neq j}^{n} \deg(\beta_s - \beta_j) + \min_{s=1, s\neq j}^{n} \deg(\beta_s - \beta_j).\end{aligned}$$

Hence and from (b) we get

$$\sum_{s=1, s\neq i_0}^{n} \deg\,(\beta_s - \beta_{i_0}) < \sum_{s=1, s\neq j}^{n} \deg(\beta_s - \beta_j).$$

Then there exists $s \neq i_0$, $s \neq j$ such that

$$\deg\,(\beta_s - \beta_{i_0}) < \deg(\beta_s - \beta_j).$$

Hence and from (2.5) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\deg(\beta_j - \beta_{i_0}) &= \deg(\beta_j - \beta_s + \beta_s - \beta_{i_0}) > \deg(\beta_s - \beta_{i_0})\\ &\geqslant \deg(\beta_{j_0} - \beta_{i_0}) = \deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_{i_0})\end{aligned}$$

In consequence

$$\deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j) = \deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_{i_0} + \beta_{i_0} - \beta_j) > \deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_{i_0}) = \deg(\beta_{j_0} - \beta_{i_0}).$$

This gives (2.6) in case (b).

B. We shall now show that for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, $j \neq i_0$, we have

$$\deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j) = \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j). \tag{2.7}$$

Take $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$, $j \neq i_0$, and consider two cases:

(a) $\deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j) > \deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_{i_0})$,

(b) $\deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j) = \deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_{i_0})$.

By (2.5) and (2.6) there are no more cases. In case (a) we have

$$\deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j) = \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \gamma_{k_0} + \gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j) = \deg(\gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j),$$

which gives (2.7).

In case (b) by (2.4) and (2.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j) &= \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \gamma_{k_0} + \gamma_{k_0} - \beta_j) \leqslant \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \gamma_{k_0})\\ &= \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_{j_0}) \leqslant \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j),\end{aligned}$$

which gives (2.7) in case (b).

C. We notice that by (2.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\deg(f-\lambda_0)\circ\Psi_{k_0} &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}\deg\left(\gamma_{k_0}-\beta_j\right)\\ &= \sum_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^{n}\deg\left(\gamma_{k_0}-\beta_j\right)+\deg\left(\gamma_{k_0}-\beta_{i_0}\right)\\ &= \sum_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^{n}\deg\left(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_j\right)+\min_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq i_0}}^{n}\deg\left(\beta_{i_0}-\beta_j\right).\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have shown

(2.8)

$$\min_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n}\deg\left(\beta_i-\beta_j\right)+\min_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n}\deg(\beta_i-\beta_j)\right)\geqslant\min_{l=1}^{n-1}(\deg\left(f-\lambda_0\right)\circ\Psi_l).$$

D. We shall now show the inequality opposite to (2.8). There exist $l_0\in\{1,...,n-1\}$ and $j_0\in\{1,...,n\}$ such that

$$\min_{l=1}^{n-1}(\deg\left(f-\lambda_0\right)\circ\Psi_l)=\deg\left(f-\lambda_0\right)\circ\Psi_{l_0}, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\min_{j=1}^{n}\deg(\gamma_{l_0}-\beta_j)=\deg(\gamma_{l_0}-\beta_{j_0}). \tag{2.10}$$

Observe first that for any $j\in\{1,...,n\}$, $j\neq j_0$, we have by (2.10)

$$\deg\left(\beta_j-\beta_{j_0}\right)=\deg\left(\beta_j-\gamma_{l_0}+\gamma_{l_0}-\beta_{j_0}\right)\leqslant\deg(\beta_j-\gamma_{l_0}). \tag{2.11}$$

By Lemma 2.2 there exists $k_0\in\{1,...,n-1\}$ such that $\deg(\gamma_{l_0}-\beta_{j_0})=\deg\left(\beta_{k_0}-\beta_{j_0}\right)$. Hence using Lemma 2.1 and (2.11) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\deg\left(f-\lambda_0\right)\circ\Psi_{l_0} = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\deg\left(\gamma_{l_0}-\beta_j\right) &\geqslant \sum_{j=1, j\neq j_0}^{n}\deg\left(\beta_{j_0}-\beta_j\right)+\deg(\gamma_{l_0}-\beta_{j_0})\\ &\geqslant \sum_{j=1, j\neq j_0}^{n}\deg\left(\beta_{j_0}-\beta_j\right)+\min_{j=1, j\neq j_0}^{n}\deg(\beta_j-\beta_{j_0}),\end{aligned}$$

which gives the inequality opposite to (2.8).

This ends the proof. □

3. CRITICAL VALUES AT INFINITY

We start with definitions and notation needed in the sequel.

Let $F:\mathbb{C}^n\to\mathbb{C}^m$, $n\geqslant 2$, be a polynomial mapping and let $S\subset\mathbb{C}^n$ be an unbounded set. We define

$$N(F|S):=\{\nu\in\mathbb{R}:\exists A,B>0\,\forall z\in S\,(|z|>B\Rightarrow|F(z)|\geqslant A\,|z|^{\nu})\},$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the polycylindric norm. If $S=\mathbb{C}^n$ we put $N(F):=N(F|\mathbb{C}^n)$.

By the Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity of $F|S$ we shall mean $\mathcal{L}_\infty(F|S):=\sup N(F|S)$ when $N(F|S)\neq\emptyset$, and $-\infty$ when $N(F|S)=\emptyset$. Analogously $\mathcal{L}_\infty(F):=\sup N(F)$ when $N(F)\neq\emptyset$, and $-\infty$ when $N(F)=\emptyset$.

We give now a lemma needed in the sequel, which gives known formulas for the Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity of a polynomial on the zero set of the another one. Let g, h be polynomials in two complex variables (x, y) and

$$0 < \deg h = \deg_y h.$$

Let $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R(x,\tau) := \operatorname{Res}_y(g(x,y) - \tau, h(x,y))$ be the resultant of $g(x,y) - \tau$ and $h(x,y)$ with respect to y. We put

$$R(x,\tau) = R_0(\tau)x^K + \cdots + R_K(\tau), \quad R_0 \neq 0,$$
$$T := h^{-1}(0).$$

Lemma 3.1. *([P1], Proposition 2.4) Under above notation and assumptions there is:*

(i) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(g|T) > 0$ *if and only if* $R_0 = const.$,
(ii) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(g|T) = 0$ *if and only if* $R_0 \neq const.$ *and* $R_0(0) \neq 0$,
(iii) $-\infty < \mathcal{L}_\infty(g|T) < 0$ *if and only if there exists* r *such that* $R_0(0) = \cdots = R_r(0) = 0$ *and* $R_{r+1}(0) \neq 0$,
(iv) $L_\infty(g|T) = -\infty$ *if and only if* $R_0(0) = \cdots = R_K(0) = 0$.

Moreover, in case (i)

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(g|T) = \left[\max_{i=1}^{K} \frac{\deg R_i}{i}\right]^{-1}$$

and in case (iii)

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(g|T) = -\left[\min_{i=1}^{r} \frac{\operatorname{ord}_0 R_i}{r+1-i}\right]^{-1}.$$

□

Let f be a polynomial in two complex variables of the form (2.1) and $\deg f > 1$.. Fix $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, denote $z := (x, y)$ and define

$$S_{\lambda_0} := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : f(z) = \lambda_0\},$$
$$S_y := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^2 : f'_y(z) = 0\}.$$

In notation of Lemma 2.1 we put $\Phi_i(t) := (t^D, \beta_i(t))$ for $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ and as previously $\Psi_j(t) := (t^D, \gamma_j(t))$ for $j \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$.

Under these notation we give, without a proof, a simple lemma which follows easily from Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 3.2. *We have*

(i) $\deg \Phi_i = D,\ i = 1, ..., n,\ \ \deg \Psi_j = D,\ j = 1, ..., n-1$,
(ii) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y|S_{\lambda_0}) = \frac{1}{D} \min_{i=1}^{n} \deg f'_y \circ \Phi_i$,
(iii) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0|S_y) = \frac{1}{D} \min_{j=1}^{n-1} \deg (f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_j$.

□

Now, we give a theorem important in the sequel.

Theorem 3.3. *If* $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0, f'_y) < 0$, *then*

(i) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0, f'_y) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0|S_y)$,
(ii) $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(f)$.

Moreover, if additionally $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) \neq -\infty$ *then*

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0|S_y) < \mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y|S_{\lambda_0}). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Let us start from (i). In the case $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) = -\infty$ we get easily (cf. [CK3], Theorem 3.1(iv)) that $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0|S_y) = -\infty$, which gives (i) in this case.

Let us assume now that $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) \neq -\infty$. In this case by the Main Theorem in [CK1], (cf. [CK4], Theorem 1) we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) = \min(\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0|S_y), \mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y|S_{\lambda_0})). \tag{3.2}$$

Hence to prove (i) in this case it suffices to show (3.1).

Assume to the contrary that (3.1) does not hold. Then by (3.2) and the assumption of the theorem we have $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y|S_{\lambda_0}) < 0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.2(ii) there exists $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ such that

$$\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_i = D\mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y|S_{\lambda_0}). \tag{3.3}$$

By the above we get $\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_i < 0$. Hence and by Lemma 2.1(c) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_i &= \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \deg(\beta_i - \beta_j) \\ &> \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \deg(\beta_i - \beta_j) + \min_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \deg(\beta_i - \beta_j).\end{aligned}$$

In consequence we get

$$\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_i > \min_{k=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1, j\neq k}^{n} \deg(\beta_k - \beta_j) + \min_{j=1, j\neq k}^{n} \deg(\beta_k - \beta_j) \right).$$

Hence by Proposition 2.3, Lemma 3.2(iii) and (3.3)

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0|S_y) < \mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y|S_{\lambda_0}),$$

which gives a contradiction. Then (3.1) holds.

Assertion (ii) is a simple consequence of the facts $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0|S_y) < 0$, Lemma 3.1 and (1.4).

This ends the proof. □

Let us fix the same notation as in Theorem 3.3.

Theorem 3.4. *If* $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) < 0$, *then*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) - 1. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume, as before, that $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) > -\infty$. By Theorem 3.3(i) it suffices to show that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0|S_y) - 1. \tag{3.5}$$

We shall first show the inequality

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \geqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0|S_y) - 1. \tag{3.6}$$

According to definition (1.2) of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ it suffices to show that for any meromorphic curve $\Phi(t) = (\varphi_1(t), \varphi_2(t))$ satisfying

$$\deg \Phi > 0, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi < 0, \tag{3.8}$$

we have

$$\frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi} \geqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) - 1. \tag{3.9}$$

From (3.7) and (3.8) it easily follows $\deg \varphi_1 > 0$. So, without loss of generality we may assume that $\Phi(t) = (t^{\deg \varphi_1}, \varphi(t))$. Then by (3.8) we also get easily that $\deg \Phi = \deg \varphi_1$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3.2(iii) it follows that there exists $l_* \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) = \frac{\deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_*}}{\deg \Psi_{l_*}}. \tag{3.10}$$

Hence we get that inequality (3.9) can be replaced by the inequality

$$\frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi} \geqslant \frac{\deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_*}}{\deg \Psi_{l_*}} - 1. \tag{3.11}$$

At the cost of superpositions of Φ and Ψ_{l_*}, if necessary, with appropriate powers of t^α and t^β, which does not change the value of fraction in (3.11), we may assume that $\deg \Phi = \deg \Psi_{l_*}$. Moreover, increasing D in Lemma 2.1 we may also assume that $\deg \Phi = D$. Summing up, to show (3.6) it suffices to prove

$$\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi \geqslant \deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_*} - D. \tag{3.12}$$

Before the proof of this we notice that inequality (3.8) implies easily the following

$$\deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi \leqslant \deg \nabla f \circ \Phi + D. \tag{3.13}$$

Consider now two cases:
(a) there exists $l_0 \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$ such that

$$\deg(\varphi - \gamma_{l_0}) < \min_{i=1}^{n} \deg(\varphi - \beta_i),$$

(b) for each $l \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$

$$\deg(\varphi - \gamma_l) \geqslant \min_{i=1}^{n} \deg(\varphi - \beta_i).$$

In the case (a) for each $j \in \{1, ..., n\}$ we have

$$\deg(\gamma_{l_0} - \beta_j) = \deg(\gamma_{l_0} - \varphi + \varphi - \beta_j) = \deg(\varphi - \beta_j).$$

Then

$$\deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_0} \leqslant \deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi.$$

Hence, from (3.10) and Lemma 3.2(iii) we get

$$\deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_*} \leqslant \deg\,(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi. \tag{3.14}$$

By (3.13) and (3.14) we get (3.12) in case (a).

We shall now show (3.12) in the case (b). Let $\min_{i=1}^{n} \deg(\varphi - \beta_i) = \deg(\varphi - \beta_{i_0})$ for some $i_0 \in \{1, ..., n\}$. Then for each $l \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$

$$\deg(\beta_{i_0} - \gamma_l) = \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \varphi + \varphi - \gamma_l) \leqslant \deg(\varphi - \gamma_l).$$

Hence

$$\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_{i_0} \leqslant \deg f'_y \circ \Phi. \tag{3.15}$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.3, Lemma 3.2(iii), and (3.10)

$$\begin{aligned}\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_{i_0} &= \sum_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^{n} \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j)\\ &= \sum_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^{n} \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j) + \min_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^{n} \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j) - \min_{j=1, j\neq i_0}^{n} \deg(\beta_{i_0} - \beta_j)\\ &\geqslant \min_{k=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1, j\neq k}^{n} \deg(\beta_k - \beta_j) + \min_{j=1, j\neq k}^{n} \deg(\beta_k - \beta_j)\right) - D\\ &= D\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) - D = \deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_1} - D.\end{aligned}$$

Hence and by (3.15) we get

$$\deg f'_y \circ \Phi \geqslant \deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_{1_*}} - D. \tag{3.16}$$

By (3.16) and the obvious inequality $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi \geqslant \deg f'_y \circ \Phi$ we get inequality (3.12) in case (b). Then we have proved (3.12) and in consequence (3.6).

To finish the proof we have to show

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) - 1. \tag{3.17}$$

By assumption, Theorem 3.3(i) and (3.10) we have

$$\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_*} < 0. \tag{3.18}$$

Hence

$$\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_{l_*} = \deg \nabla f \circ \Psi_{l_*} + D. \tag{3.19}$$

Hence and from (3.10) we get

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) - 1 = \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Psi_{l_*}}{\deg \Psi_{l_*}}.$$

Hence taking into account (3.18) and (1.2) we obtain (3.17).

This ends the proof of the theorem. □

We shall now give three simple corollaries of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4.

Corollary 3.5. *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0, f'_y) < 0$,
(ii) $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < -1$,
(iii) $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < 0$,
(iv) $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(f)$,
(v) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) < 0$.

Proof. (i)⇒(ii). Theorem 3.4.
(ii)⇒(iii). Obvious.
(iii)⇒(i). Obvious.
(i)⇒(iv). Theorem 3.3(ii).
(iv)⇒(i). [CK3], Theorem 3.1.
(i)⇒(v). Theorem 3.3(i).

(v)$\Rightarrow$(i). Obvious.

This ends the proof. ☐

Corollary 3.6. *If* $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) \leqslant -1$, *then*

(i) *there exists* $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ *such that* $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$,

(ii) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_y)$.

Proof. Let Φ, $\deg \Phi > 0$, be a meromorphic curve on which the Łojasiewicz exponent $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f)$ is attained. Then

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) = \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi}. \tag{3.20}$$

We shall show

$$\deg f \circ \Phi \leqslant 0. \tag{3.21}$$

Indeed, it suffices to consider the case $\deg f \circ \Phi \neq 0$. Then

$$\frac{\deg f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi} \leqslant \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi} + 1 = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) + 1 \leqslant 0,$$

which gives (3.21).

Inequality (3.21) implies that there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\deg (f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi < 0. \tag{3.22}$$

Then by (3.20), (3.22) and (1.2) we get $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f)$. The opposite inequality is obvious. This gives (i).

From (3.22), the assumption and (3.20) we get $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0, f'_y) < 0$. Hence according to (i) and Theorems 3.4 and 3.3(i) we get

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) - 1.$$

Hence and from the obvious inequality

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) - 1 \geqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_y)$$

we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) \geqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_y).$$

The opposite inequality is obvious, which gives (ii).

This ends the proof. ☐

Corollary 3.7. *If* $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0, f'_y) < 0$ *and functions* $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$, *meromorphic at infinity, are as in Lemma 2.1 then*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) + 1 = \frac{1}{D} \min_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \deg(\beta_i - \beta_j) + \min_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \deg(\beta_i - \beta_j) \right). \tag{3.23}$$

Proof. By Theorems 3.4 and 3.3 (i) we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) + 1 = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y). \tag{3.24}$$

According to Lemma 3.2

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) = \frac{1}{D} \min_{l=1}^{n-1} \deg (f - \lambda_0) \circ \Psi_l. \tag{3.25}$$

Now, (3.24), (3.25) and Proposition 2.3 implies (3.23).

This ends the proof. ☐

At the end of this section we notice that from Corollary 3.5 it follows that all results of this section concern critical values of f at infinity. Indeed, by Corollary 3.5 one can always replace the assumption $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y) < 0$ with the assumption $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda(f)$.

We shall now discuss the connection of the above three corollaries with the results by Ha [H2]. It shall be shown in Section 5 that the above Łojasiewicz exponent $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$, defined by (1.2), coincides with the Łojasiewicz exponent $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$, defined by (1.1), introduced by Ha in [H2]. Thus Corollary 3.5 is a changed and extended version of Theorems 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 in [H2]. In turn, Corollaries 3.6(i) and 3.7 correspond exactly to Theorems 1.4.3 and 1.4.1 in [H2], respectively.

4. Effective formulas for $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$

In this section f is a polynomial in two complex variables of the form (2.1). Let $(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $Q(x,\lambda,u) := \operatorname{Res}_y(f-\lambda, f'_y - u)$ be the resultant of the polynomials $f-\lambda$ and $f'_y - u$ with respect to the variable y. By the definition of the resultant we get easily that $Q(0,\lambda,0) = \pm n^n\lambda^{n-1}+$ terms of lower degrees. Hence $Q \neq 0$. We put

$$Q(x,\lambda,u) = Q_0(\lambda,u)x^N + \cdots + Q_N(\lambda,u), \quad Q_0 \neq 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Let us pass now to the effective calculations of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$. We start with the first main theorem conerning the case when λ_0 is a critical value of f at infinity.

Theorem 4.1. *A point $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ is a critical value of f at infinity if and only if $Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) = 0$. Moreover*

(i) $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = -\infty$ *if and only if* $Q_0(\lambda_0,0) = \cdots = Q_N(\lambda_0,0) = 0$,

(ii)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = -1 - \left[\min_{i=0}^{r} \frac{\operatorname{ord}_{(\lambda_0,0)} Q_i(\lambda,u)}{r+1-i}\right]^{-1}$$

if and only if there exists $r \in \{0,\dots,N-1\}$ *such that* $Q_0(\lambda_0,0) = \cdots = Q_r(\lambda_0,0) = 0$, $Q_{r+1}(\lambda_0,0) \neq 0$.

Proof. By Corollary 3.5 (iv) $\iff$ (i) and Theorem 3.1 in [CK3] we get the first assertion of the theorem. The second one follows from Theorems 3.1 and 3.3 in [CK3] which give formulas for $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f-\lambda_0, f'_y)$ in the case $Q_0(\lambda_0,0) = 0$ and Theorem 3.4. □

Now let us pass to the more complicated case when λ_0 is not a critical value of f at infinity. Similarly as previously we shall use resultant (4.1). We shall now prove two theorems on dependence of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ for $\lambda_0 \notin \Lambda(f)$ on the coefficient $Q_0(\lambda,u)$ of the resultant (4.1).

Directly from the first assertion of the above theorem we have.

Corollary 4.2. *A point $\lambda_0 \notin \Lambda(f)$ if and only if $Q_0(\lambda_0,0) \neq 0$.*

□

The first theorem shall be preceded by a lemma, well known in local case. First we introduce notations.

Let $\mathcal{M}(t)$ be the field of germs of meromorphic functions at infinity i.e. the field of all Laurent series of the form $\sum_{n=k}^{-\infty} a_n t^n$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, convergent in a neighbourhood of $\infty \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$. Let $\mathcal{M}(t)^* := \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}(t^{1/k})$ be the field of convergent Puiseux series at infinity. Similarly as in the local case $\mathcal{M}(t)^*$ is an algebraically closed field. If $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}(t)^*$ and $\varphi(t) = \psi(t^{1/k})$ for $\psi \in \mathcal{M}(t)$, then we define $\deg \varphi := (1/k) \deg \psi$.

Using simple properties of the function deg and the Vieta formulae we obtain

Lemma 4.3. *Let*

$$P(x,t) = c_0(t)x^N + c_1(t)x^{N-1} + \cdots + c_N(t) = c_0(t)(x - \varphi_1(t)) \cdots (x - \varphi_N(t)),$$

where $c_0, c_1, ..., c_N \in \mathcal{M}(t)$, $c_0 \neq 0$, $\varphi_1, ..., \varphi_N \in \mathcal{M}(t)^*$. *Then*

$$\max_{i=1}^{N} \deg \varphi_i = \max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg c_i - \deg c_0}{i}.$$

We shall now prove the second main theorem of the paper.

Theorem 4.4. *If* $\lambda_0 \notin \Lambda(f)$ *and* $\deg_u Q_0(\lambda, u) = 0$ *then* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) > 0$ *and*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = \left[\max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg_u Q_i(\lambda, u)}{i}\right]^{-1}. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Put $\delta := \left[\max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg_u Q_i(\lambda,u)}{i}\right]^{-1}$. By an elementary property of the resultant Q it follows that $\deg_u Q(\lambda, u) > 0$. Hence $\delta > 0$.

We first show that

$$\delta \leqslant \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f). \tag{4.3}$$

Take an arbitrary meromorphic curve $\Phi(t) = (x(t), y(t))$ such that $\deg \Phi > 0$ and $\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi < 0$. To show (4.3) it suffices to prove

$$\frac{\deg f'_y \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi} \geqslant \delta. \tag{4.4}$$

Notice that inequality $\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi < 0$ and (2.1) implies immediately $\deg \Phi = \deg x$. Put $\lambda(t) := f \circ \Phi(t)$, $u(t) := f'_y \circ \Phi(t)$. Then (4.4) takes the form

$$\frac{\deg u}{\deg x} \geqslant \delta. \tag{4.5}$$

By a property of the resultant we have

$$Q(x(t), \lambda(t), u(t)) \equiv 0. \tag{4.6}$$

By Corollary 4.2 and the assumption of the theorem we have $Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) \neq 0$ and Q_0 does not depend on u. Since $\deg(\lambda(t) - \lambda_0) < 0$ then

$$\deg Q_0(\lambda(t), u(t)) = 0. \tag{4.7}$$

By (4.7) and (4.6) taking into account $\deg x > 0$ and $\deg \lambda \leqslant 0$ we get easily

$$\deg u > 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Consider the polynomial in variable x

$$Q(x, \lambda(t), u(t)) = Q_0(\lambda(t), u(t))x^N + \cdots + Q_N(\lambda(t), u(t))$$

with coefficients meromorphic at infinity. Identifying meromorphic functions at infinity with with their germs in $\mathcal{M}(t)$ and using (4.6), (4.7) and Lemma 4.3 we get

$$\deg x(t) \leqslant \max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg Q_i(\lambda(t), u(t))}{i}.$$

Hence and from the inequality $\deg \lambda(t) \leqslant 0$ we obtain

$$\deg x(t) \leqslant \deg u(t) \max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg_u Q_i(\lambda, u)}{i} = \frac{1}{\delta} \deg u(t).$$

This gives (4.5) and in consequence (4.4) and then (4.3).

We shall now prove that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant \delta. \tag{4.9}$$

Let us introduce notations. Let

$$Q_i(\lambda, u) = Q_0^i(\lambda) u^{k_i} + \cdots + Q_{k_i}^i(\lambda), \tag{4.10}$$

$$\alpha_i := \operatorname{ord}_{\lambda_0} Q_0^i(\lambda) \tag{4.11}$$

for $i = 1, ..., N$. Take now an arbitrary $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and put

$$u_M(t) := t^M, \qquad \lambda(t) := \lambda_0 + \frac{1}{t}. \tag{4.12}$$

Since $Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) \neq 0$ and Q_0 does not depend on u then

$$\deg Q_0(\lambda(t), u_M(t)) = 0. \tag{4.13}$$

On the other hand by (4.10), (4.11) and (4.12) for almost all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\deg Q_i(\lambda(t), u_M(t)) = Mk_i - \alpha_i, \quad i = 1, ..., N. \tag{4.14}$$

Define $\alpha := \min\{\alpha_i : \frac{k_i}{i} = \delta^{-1}\}$. Then from (4.14) and definition of δ it follows that for almost all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg Q_i(\lambda(t), u_M(t))}{i} = M\delta^{-1} - \alpha. \tag{4.15}$$

Consider the polynomial in variable x

$$Q(x, \lambda(t), u_M(t)) = Q_0(\lambda(t), u_M(t)) x^N + \cdots + Q_N(\lambda(t), u_M(t))$$

with coefficients meromorphic at infinity. Identifying meromorphic functions at infinity with their germs in $\mathcal{M}(t)$, applying Lemma 4.3 and taking into account (4.13), we obtain that there exists $\varphi_M \in \mathcal{M}(t)^*$ such that

$$Q(\varphi_M(t), \lambda(t), u_M(t)) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(t)^* \tag{4.16}$$

and

$$\deg \varphi_M(t) = \max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg Q_i(\lambda(t), u_M(t))}{i}.$$

Taking into account (4.15) for almost all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\deg \varphi_M(t) = M\delta^{-1} - \alpha. \tag{4.17}$$

Consider polynomials $f(\varphi_M(t), y) - \lambda(t)$ and $f'_y(\varphi_M(t), y) - u_M(t)$ in variable y with coefficients in $\mathcal{M}(t)^*$. By (4.16) their resultant is equal to zero in $\mathcal{M}(t)^*$. Then there exists a function $\psi_M(t) \in \mathcal{M}(t)^*$ such that

$$f(\varphi_M(t), \psi_M(t)) = \lambda(t), \tag{4.18}$$

$$f'_y(\varphi_M(t), \psi_M(t)) = u_M(t). \tag{4.19}$$

By (4.18) and (2.1) we get

$$\deg \varphi_M \geqslant \deg \psi_M. \tag{4.20}$$

By definition of $\mathcal{M}(t)^*$ there exists $D \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi_M(t^D), \psi_M(t^D) \in \mathcal{M}(t)$. Then there exists a meromorphic mapping at infinity $\Phi_M(t) = (x_M(t), y_M(t))$ such that the germs of $x_M(t)$ and $y_M(t)$ at infinity are equal $\varphi_M(t^D)$ and $\psi_M(t^D)$, respectively. By (4.20) and (4.17) we obtain

$$\deg \Phi_M = \deg x_M = D(M\delta^{-1} - \alpha). \tag{4.21}$$

By (4.18) and (4.19) we have

$$\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi_M = \deg(\lambda(t^D) - \lambda_0) = -D < 0, \tag{4.22}$$

$$\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_M = \deg u_M(t^D) = MD. \tag{4.23}$$

By (4.21) for almost all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ $\deg \Phi_M > 0$. Hence, from (4.22) and the first equality in (4.21) we easily get $\deg f'_x \circ \Phi_M \leqslant \deg f'_y \circ \Phi_M$, that is

$$\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M = \deg f'_y \circ \Phi_M. \tag{4.24}$$

By (4.21), (4.23) and (4.24) for almost all $M \in \mathbb{N}$ we get

$$\frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M}{\deg \Phi_M} = \frac{M}{M\delta^{-1} - \alpha}.$$

Summing up, we have found a sequence $\{\Phi_M\}$ of mappings meromorphic at infinity, such that for almost all $M \in \mathbb{N}$, $\deg \Phi_M > 0$, (4.22) holds and

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M}{\deg \Phi_M} = \delta,$$

which in according with (1.2) gives (4.9).

This ends the proof. □

We shall now prove the third main theorem of the paper.

Theorem 4.5. *If* $\lambda_0 \notin \Lambda(f)$ *and* $\deg_u Q_0(\lambda, u) > 0$ *then* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = 0$.

Proof. If $\deg f = 1$ then we easily check that $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = 0$. Assume that $\deg f > 1$. Let us notice first that by assumption and Corollary 3.5 (iii)⇒(iv)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \geqslant 0. \tag{4.25}$$

On the other hand, by assumption and Corollary 4.2 we have

$$Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) \neq 0. \tag{4.26}$$

To show the inequality opposite to (4.25) we consider two cases:

(a) $\deg Q_0(\lambda_0, u) > 0$,

(b) $\deg Q_0(\lambda_0, u) = 0$.

In case (a) taking into account (4.26) and Lemma 3.1 we get $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y | f^{-1}(\lambda_0)) = 0$. Hence and by Lemma 3.2 (ii) it follows that there exists $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ such that $\deg f'_y \circ \Phi_i = 0$. On the other hand, from the form of f we easily conclude that $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_i = \deg f'_y \circ \Phi_i$. Summing up, $\deg \Phi_i > 0$ and

$$\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi_i = -\infty, \qquad \deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_i = 0. \tag{4.27}$$

Then definition (1.2) of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ implies $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant 0$, which together with (4.25) gives the assertion of the theorem in case (a).

Let us pass to case (b).

We first show that there exist functions $\lambda(t), u(t)$, meromorphic at infinity, such that

$$\deg(\lambda(t)-\lambda_0) < 0, \tag{4.28}$$

$$\deg u(t) > 0, \tag{4.29}$$

$$Q_0(\lambda(t), u(t)) \equiv 0. \tag{4.30}$$

Let

$$Q_0(\lambda, u) = Q_0^0(\lambda)u^{k_0} + \cdots + Q_{k_0}^0(\lambda), \quad Q_0^0 \not\equiv 0.$$

In this case taking into account (4.26) we have

$$\operatorname{ord}_{\lambda_0} Q_{k_0}^0 = 0, \qquad \operatorname{ord}_{\lambda_0} Q_i^0 > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i = 0, ..., k_0-1. \tag{4.31}$$

Put $\tilde{\lambda}(t) := \lambda_0 + \frac{1}{t}$ and consider the polynomial in variable u

$$Q_0(\tilde{\lambda}(t), u) = Q_0^0(\tilde{\lambda}(t))u^{k_0} + \cdots + Q_{k_0}^0(\tilde{\lambda}(t)) \tag{4.32}$$

with coefficients meromorphic at infinity. Notice first that by (4.31) and definition of $\tilde{\lambda}$

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i=1}^{k_0} \frac{\deg Q_i^0(\tilde{\lambda}(t)) - \deg Q_0^0(\tilde{\lambda}(t))}{i} &\geqslant \\ \geqslant \frac{\deg Q_{k_0}^0(\tilde{\lambda}(t)) - \deg Q_0^0(\tilde{\lambda}(t))}{k_0} &= \frac{1}{k_0} \operatorname{ord}_{\lambda_0} Q_0^0 > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

Identifying meromorphic functions at infinity with their germs in $\mathcal{M}(t)$ and using Lemma 4.3 to polynomial (4.32) and taking into account (4.33) we get that there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}(t)^*$ such that

$$Q_0(\tilde{\lambda}(t), \varphi(t)) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(t)^*, \tag{4.34}$$

$$\deg \varphi > 0. \tag{4.35}$$

By definition of $\mathcal{M}(t)^*$ there exists $D \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi(t^D) \in \mathcal{M}(t)$. Then there exists a function $u(t)$ meromorphic at infinity which germs at infinity is equal to $\varphi(t^D)$. Put $\lambda(t) := \tilde{\lambda}(t^D)$. By definition of $\tilde{\lambda}$, (4.35) and (4.34) we obtain that the functions $\lambda(t), u(t)$ satisfy (4.28), (4.29) and (4.30).

Now we consider two subcases:

(b_1) for every $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$ $Q_i(\lambda(t), u(t)) \equiv 0$,

(b_2) there exists $i \in \{1, ..., N\}$ such that $Q_i(\lambda(t), u(t)) \not\equiv 0$.

Consider case (b_1). Then for every $M \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$Q(t^M, \lambda(t), u(t)) \equiv 0. \tag{4.36}$$

Consider polynomials in variable y,

$$f(t^M, y) - \lambda(t), \qquad f'_y(t^M, y) - u(t)$$

with coefficients meromorphic at infinity. According to (4.36) their resultant vanishes identically. Then there exist a function $y_M(t)$, meromorphic at infinity, and an integer $D \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$f(t^{MD}, y_M(t)) = \lambda(t^D), \tag{4.37}$$

$$f'_y(t^{MD}, y_M(t)) = u(t^D). \tag{4.38}$$

Define $\Phi_M(t) := (t^{MD}, y_M(t))$. By (4.37) and (4.28) we get

$$\deg(f \circ \Phi_M - \lambda_0) < 0. \tag{4.39}$$

Hence and from (2.1) we obtain

$$\deg \Phi_M = MD. \tag{4.40}$$

By (4.39) and (4.40) we easily get $\deg f'_x \circ \Phi_M \leqslant \deg f'_y \circ \Phi_M$, which means $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M = \deg f'_y \circ \Phi_M$. Hence by (4.38) we obtain

$$\frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M}{\deg \Phi_M} = \frac{\deg u}{M}. \tag{4.41}$$

Summing up, we have found a sequence $\{\Phi_M\}$ of mappings meromorphic at infinity, such that $\deg \Phi_M > 0$ and (4.39) holds. Moreover, by (4.41)

$$\lim_{M\to\infty} \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M}{\deg \Phi_M} = 0,$$

which according to definition (1.2) gives $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant 0$. Hence and by (4.25) we get the assertion of the theorem in case (b$_1$).

Let us pass to case (b$_2$). Put $\lambda_M(t) := \lambda(t) + \frac{1}{t^M}$ for $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and $M > -\deg(\lambda(t) - \lambda_0)$. It is easy to see that for every $i \in \{0, 1, ..., N\}$ there exists an integer $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for any M

$$\deg(Q_i(\lambda(t), u(t)) - Q_i(\lambda_M(t), u(t))) \leqslant -M + \alpha_i. \tag{4.42}$$

Indeed, let $Q_i(\lambda, u(t)) = R^i_0(t)\lambda^{l_i} + \cdots + R^i_{l_i}(t)$. Then it suffices to take $\alpha_i := \max_{j=0}^{l_i} \deg R^i_j(t)$. By (4.42) we also easily obtain that for almost all M there exists an integer $d_M \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$\deg Q_0(\lambda_M(t), u(t))) = d_M, \tag{4.43}$$

$$d_M \leqslant -M + \alpha_0. \tag{4.44}$$

Indeed, in our case (b) by (4.26) and (4.30) we see that the polynomial $Q_0(\lambda, u(t))$ in variable λ is not constant i.e. $\deg_\lambda Q_0(\lambda, u(t)) > 0$. Then for almost all M there exists an integer $d_M \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that (4.43) holds. Inequality (4.44) is a conequence of (4.42) and (4.43).

Consider now for sufficiently large M the following polynomial in variable x

$$Q(x, \lambda_M(t), u(t))) = Q_0(\lambda_M(t), u(t))x^N + \cdots + Q_N(\lambda_M(t), u(t)), \tag{4.45}$$

with coefficients meromorphic at infinity.

Let us notice there exists $i_0 \in \{1, ..., N\}$ such that

$$\lim_{M\to\infty}(\deg Q_{i_0}(\lambda_M(t), u(t)) - \deg Q_0(\lambda_M(t), u(t))) = \infty. \tag{4.46}$$

In fact, by assumption (b$_2$) there exists i_0 such that $Q_{i_0}(\lambda(t), u(t))) \not\equiv 0$. Put $d_{i_0} := \deg Q_{i_0}(\lambda(t), u(t)))$. Then $d_{i_0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and by (4.42) for $-M < d_{i_0} - \alpha_{i_0}$ we have $\deg Q_{i_0}(\lambda_M(t), u(t)) = d_{i_0}$. Hence by (4.43) and (4.44) we get (4.46).

Let us return to polynomial (4.45). Identifying meromorphic functions at infinity with their germs in $\mathcal{M}(t)$ and using Lemma 4.3 to polynomial (4.45) we get that there exists $\varphi_M \in \mathcal{M}(t)^*$ such that

$$Q(\varphi_M(t), \lambda_M(t), u(t)) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{M}(t)^*, \tag{4.47}$$

$$\deg \varphi_M(t) = \max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg Q_i(\lambda_M(t), u(t)) - \deg(Q_0(\lambda_M(t), u(t))}{i}. \tag{4.48}$$

By (4.47), similarly as in the proof of Theorem 4.4, there exists $\psi_M(t) \in \mathcal{M}(t)^*$ such that

$$f(\varphi_M(t), \psi_M(t)) = \lambda_M(t), \tag{4.49}$$

$$f'_y(\varphi_M(t), \psi_M(t)) = u(t). \tag{4.50}$$

Then there exist an integer $D_M \in \mathbb{N}$ and functions $x_M(t), y_M(t)$ meromorphic at infinity which germs at infinity are equal to $\varphi_M(t^{D_M}), \psi_M(t^{D_M})$, respectively. Put $\Phi_M(t) := (x_M(t), y_M(t))$. By (4.49) and the definition of $\lambda_M(t)$ we have

$$\deg(f \circ \Phi_M - \lambda_0) < 0. \tag{4.51}$$

Hence and by (2.1) we get

$$\deg \Phi_M(t) = D_M \deg \varphi_M(t). \tag{4.52}$$

By (4.51) and (4.52) we get $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M = \deg f'_y \circ \Phi_M$. Hence according to (4.50) and (4.52) we get

$$\frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M}{\deg \Phi_M} = \frac{\deg u(t)}{\deg \varphi_M(t)}.$$

This, together with (4.46) and (4.48), gives for almost all $M \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\deg \Phi_M > 0$$

and

$$\lim_{M \to \infty} \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_M}{\deg \Phi_M} = 0.$$

Hence and (4.51), taking into account definition (2.1), we get $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant 0$. Hence and by (4.25) we get the assertion of the theorem in case (b$_2$).

This ends the proof of the theorem. □

As a corollary of Theorems 4.1, 4.4 and 4.5 we obtain a theorem on the function $\mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$.

Theorem 4.6. *The function $\mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ takes the values in $[-\infty, -1)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda(f)$. Outside $\Lambda(f)$ this function is constant and non-negative. Moreover,*

(a) *if $\deg_u Q_0(\lambda, u) = 0$, then $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = const. > 0$ for $\lambda \notin \Lambda(f)$,*
(b) *if $\deg_u Q_0(\lambda, u) > 0$, then $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = const. = 0$ for $\lambda \notin \Lambda(f)$.*

□

At the end we illustrate Theorem 4.6 with three simple examples.

Example 4.7. (a) *For $f(x,y) := y^2 + x$ we have $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \equiv 1$.*

(b) *For $f(x,y) := y^{n+1} + xy^n + y$, $n > 1$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} & \text{for} \quad \lambda \neq 0, \\ -1 - \frac{1}{n-1} & \text{for} \quad \lambda = 0. \end{cases}$$

(c) *For $f(x,y) := y^2$ we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for} \quad \lambda \neq 0, \\ -\infty & \text{for} \quad \lambda = 0. \end{cases}$$

□

At the end of this section we compare the Łojasiewicz exponent of ∇f at infinity near a fibre and on the fibre. Precisely, we shall compare the function $\mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ to the function $\mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(\lambda))$ for a fixed polynomial f of the form (2.1). For simplicity we put

$$S_\lambda := f^{-1}(\lambda) \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Theorem 4.8. *The functions* $\mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ *and* $\mathbb{C} \ni \lambda \longmapsto \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_\lambda)$ *are identical besides a finite set of points* λ_0*, in which* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_{\lambda_0})$*. This inequality holds if and only if when* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \in (-\infty, -1)$ *or when* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) > 0$ *and*

$$\max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg_u Q_i(\lambda, u)}{i} > \max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg_u Q_i(\lambda_0, u)}{i}. \tag{4.53}$$

Proof. Notice first that by the form (2.1) of f and Lemma 3.2 we easily get

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_\lambda) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y | S_\lambda) \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{4.54}$$

Let $Q(x, \lambda, u) = Q_0(\lambda, u)x^N + \cdots + Q_N(\lambda, u)$, $\quad Q_0 \neq 0$, be, as before, the resultant of $f(x,y) - \lambda$ and $f'_y(x,y) - u$ with respect to y. Fix $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ and consider four cases:

(a) $Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) \neq 0$ and $\deg_u Q_0(\lambda, u) = 0$. Then by Lemma 3.1 and (4.54) we have

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_{\lambda_0}) = \left[\max_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\deg_u Q_i(\lambda_0, u)}{i} \right]^{-1}.$$

Hence and by Corollary 4.2 and Theorem 4.4 we get $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_{\lambda_0}) > \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ if and only if (4.53) holds. Obviously, the set of such points is finite.

(b) $Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) \neq 0$ and $\deg_u Q_0(\lambda, u) > 0$. Then by Lemma 3.1, (4.54) and Theorem 4.5 we have $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_{\lambda_0}) = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = 0$.

(c) There exists $r \in \{0, ..., N-1\}$ such that $Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) = \cdots = Q_r(\lambda_0, 0) = 0$ $Q_{r+1}(\lambda_0, 0) \neq 0$. Then by Theorem 4.1 $-\infty < \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < 0$. Hence and by Corollary 3.5, $\mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0, f'_y) < 0$. Then by Theorems 3.4, 3.3 and (4.54) we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < \mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0, f'_y) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f - \lambda_0 | S_y) < \mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y | S_{\lambda_0}) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_{\lambda_0}).$$

Obviously, the set of $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ for which (c) holds is contained in $\Lambda(f)$ and thus finite.

(d) $Q_0(\lambda_0, 0) = \cdots = Q_N(\lambda_0, 0) = 0$. Then by Theorem 4.1, Lemma 3.1 and (4.54) we have $-\infty = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(f'_y | S_{\lambda_0}) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_{\lambda_0})$.

This ends the proof. □

We illustrate the above theorem with the same polynomials as in Example 4.7.

Example 4.9. (a) *For* $f(x,y) := y^2 + x$ *we have* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_\lambda) = 1$ *for* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

(b) *For* $f(x,y) := y^{n+1} + xy^n + y$ *we have* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}$ *for* $\lambda \neq 0$ *and* $-1 - \frac{1}{n-1} = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,0}(f) < \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_0) = 0$.

(c) *For* $f(x,y) := y^2$ *we have* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | S_\lambda)$ *for any* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

□

5. EQUIVALENCE OF THE DEFINITIONS OF $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ AND $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$

In the Introduction we have defined $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ by formulas (1.1) and (1.2), respectively. We notice that the limit in (1.1) always exists (it may happen to be $-\infty$) because by definition of $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f|f^{-1}(D_\delta))$ the function $\delta \mapsto \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f|f^{-1}(D_\delta))$ is non-increasing.

We now prove

Theorem 5.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ be a non-constant polynomial and $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$$

holds.

Proof. Obviously

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f).$$

We shall now prove the opposite inequality. Since the set $\Lambda(f)$ is finite then there exists $D = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \delta_0\}$ such that $(D \setminus \{\lambda_0\}) \cap \Lambda(f) = \emptyset$. According to Theorem 4.6 we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \geqslant \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \qquad \text{for } \lambda \in D. \tag{5.1}$$

Take an arbitrary $0 < \delta < \delta_0$ and put $D_\delta := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \delta\}$. Since the set $f^{-1}(\overline{D}_\delta)$ is semi-algebraic in $\mathbb{C}^2$ by the Curve Selection Lemma the exponent $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f|f^{-1}(\overline{D}_\delta))$ is attained on a meromorphic curve Φ_δ, $\deg \Phi_\delta > 0$, lying in this set (see [CK4], Proposition 1). It is easy to see that there exists $\tilde{\lambda} \in \overline{D}_\delta \subset D$ such that $\deg(f - \tilde{\lambda}) \circ \Phi_\delta < 0$. By definition of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ and (5.1) we get $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f|f^{-1}(\overline{D}_\delta)) \geqslant \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\tilde{\lambda}}(f) \geqslant \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$. Hence

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0^+} \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f|f^{-1}(D_\delta)) = \lim_{\delta\to 0^+} \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f|f^{-1}(\overline{D}_\delta)) \geqslant \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f).$$

This ends the proof. □

6. n-DIMENSIONAL CASE

Let us start with definitions. A non-constant polynomial $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, $n \geqslant 2$, is said to satisfy the Malgrange condition for a value $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ if

$$\exists_{\eta_0,\delta_0,R_0>0}\forall_{p\in\mathbb{C}^n}(|p| > R_0 \ \wedge\ |f(p) - \lambda_0| < \delta_0 \ \Rightarrow\ |p|\,|\nabla f(p)| > \eta_0). \tag{6.1}$$

By $K_\infty(f)$ we denote the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ for which the Malgrange condition does not hold. It is easy to check that $\lambda \in K_\infty(f)$ if and only if there exists a sequence $\{p_k\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} |p_k| = \infty,\ \lim_{k\to\infty} f(p_k) = \lambda, \text{ and } \lim_{k\to\infty} |p_k|\,|\nabla f(p_k)| = 0. \tag{6.2}$$

It is known (see [JK], cf. [S]) that

$$\#K_\infty(f) < +\infty. \tag{6.3}$$

We now give a characterization of $K_\infty(f)$ in terms of the exponents $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$.

Theorem 6.1. *For $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\lambda_0 \in K_\infty(f)$,
(ii) $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < -1$,

(iii) $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < -1$.

Proof. (iii)⇒(ii)⇒(i). Take $\lambda_0 \notin K_\infty(f)$. Then λ_0 satisfies (6.1). Without loss of generality, by (6.3), we may assume that $\{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \delta_0\} \cap K_\infty(f) = \emptyset$. Take δ, $0 < \delta < \delta_0$, and put $D_\delta := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| < \delta\}$. Then by (6.1) we have $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(D_\delta)) \geqslant -1$. Hence by definition (1.1) we get $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \geqslant -1$. From an obvious inequality

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \geqslant \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \tag{6.4}$$

we also get $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \geqslant -1$. This gives the required sequence of implications.

We now show the implication (i)⇒(iii). Let $\lambda_0 \in K_\infty(f)$ and $\{p_k\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a sequence satisfying (6.2). By (6.3) there exists a closed disc $\overline{D} := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| \leqslant \delta_0\}$ such that $\overline{D} \cap K_\infty(f) = \emptyset$. Since $f^{-1}(\overline{D})$ is a semialgebraic set in $\mathbb{C}^n$, then by the Curve Selection Lemma the exponent $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(\overline{D}))$ is attained on a meromorphic curve Φ, $\deg \Phi > 0$, lying in this set (cf. [CK4], Proposition 1). Thus there exists a $\tilde{\lambda} \in \overline{D}$ such that $\deg(f - \tilde{\lambda}) \circ \Phi < 0$. On the other hand almost all elements of the sequence $\{p_k\}$ lie in $f^{-1}(\overline{D})$. Then (6.2) implies $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(\overline{D})) < -1$. In consequence $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi / \deg \Phi = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(\overline{D})) < -1$. Hence we get $\tilde{\lambda} \in K_\infty(f)$ and thus $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda_0$. Summing up, there exists a meromorphic curve Φ, $\deg \Phi > 0$, such that $\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi < 0$ and $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi / \deg \Phi < -1$. Then by definition (1.2) we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < -1.$$

This gives the desired implication and ends the proof. □

To illustrate the usefulness of $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ we show how with the help of this exponent one can find the set $K_\infty(f)$ in an example. We consider the Rabier's example (see [R], Remark 9.1).

Example 6.2. *Let* $f^R : \mathbb{C}^3 \to \mathbb{C}$, $f^R(x,y,z) := (xy-1)yz$. *Then* $K_\infty(f^R) = \{0\}$ *and* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,0}(f^R) = -\infty$.

Indeed, we first show $0 \in K_\infty(f^R)$. *Taking* $\tilde{\Phi}(t) := (t, 1/t, 0)$, *we have* $\deg \tilde{\Phi} > 0$, $f^R \circ \tilde{\Phi}(t) \equiv 0$ *and* $\deg \nabla f^R \circ \tilde{\Phi} = -\infty$. *Hence according to (1.2) we get* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,0}(f^R) = -\infty$ *and thus* $0 \in K_\infty(f^R)$. *To prove the opposite inclusion assume that there exists* $\lambda \neq 0$ *such that* $\lambda \in K_\infty(f^R)$. *Then by Theorem 6.1* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f^R) < -1$. *Then there exists a meromorphic curve* $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3)$ *such that* $\deg \Phi > 0$ *and*

$$\deg(f^R - \lambda) \circ \Phi < 0, \tag{6.5}$$

$$\deg \nabla f^R \circ \Phi < -\deg \Phi. \tag{6.6}$$

From (6.5)

$$\deg((\varphi_1\varphi_2 - 1)\varphi_2\varphi_3) = 0, \tag{6.7}$$

whereas from (6.6) we get $\deg f'_z \circ \Phi < -\deg \Phi$ *and thus*

$$\deg(\varphi_1\varphi_2 - 1)\varphi_2) < -\deg \Phi. \tag{6.8}$$

By (6.7) and (6.8) we get $-\deg \varphi_3 < -\deg \Phi$, *which is impossible.*

□

Using $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ we shall prove one more theorem

Theorem 6.3. *Let $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, $n \geqslant 2$, be a non-constant polynomial. If $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) \leqslant -1$, then there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f). \tag{6.9}$$

Proof. Let Φ, $\deg \Phi > 0$, be a meromorphic curve on which the Łojasiewicz exponent $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f)$ is attained. Then

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) = \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi}. \tag{6.10}$$

We shall show

$$\deg f \circ \Phi \leqslant 0. \tag{6.11}$$

Indeed, it suffices to consider the case $\deg f \circ \Phi \neq 0$. Then

$$\frac{\deg f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi} \leqslant \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi}{\deg \Phi} + 1 = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) + 1 \leqslant 0,$$

which gives (6.11).

Inequality (6.11) implies that there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi < 0. \tag{6.12}$$

Then by (6.10), (6.12) and (1.2) we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f).$$

The opposite inequality is obvious.

This ends the proof. □

Directly from the above theorem we obtain

Theorem 6.4. *Let $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, $n \geqslant 2$, be a non-constant polynomial. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $K_\infty(f) \neq \emptyset$,
(ii) $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) < -1$.

Proof. (i)⇒(ii). Take $\lambda_0 \in K_\infty(f)$. Then by Theorem 6.1 we have $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < -1$. Then $\mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) < -1$.

(ii)⇒(i). By Theorem 6.3 there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f) < -1$. Hence by Theorem 6.1 $\lambda_0 \in K_\infty(f)$.

This ends the proof. □

Theorem 6.5. *We have*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) \quad \textit{for} \quad \lambda \in K_\infty(f). \tag{6.13}$$

Proof. Take any $\lambda_0 \in K_\infty(f)$. Since the inequality $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \geqslant \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f)$ is obvious it suffices to show

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f). \tag{6.14}$$

Similarly as in the second part of the proof of Theorem 6.1 we take a closed disc $\overline{D}_\delta := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{C} : |\lambda - \lambda_0| \leqslant \delta\}$ such that $\overline{D}_\delta \cap K_\infty(f) = \emptyset$. Then analogously as previously we show that there exists a meromorphic curve Φ_δ lying in $f^{-1}(\overline{D}_\delta)$ such that,

$$\deg \Phi_\delta > 0,\ \deg(f - \lambda_0) \circ \Phi_\delta < 0,\ \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(\overline{D}_\delta)) = \frac{\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_\delta}{\deg \Phi_\delta}. \tag{6.15}$$

Hence and from (1.2) we get

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) \leqslant \mathcal{L}_\infty(\nabla f | f^{-1}(\overline{D}_\delta)) \tag{6.16}$$

Then taking $\delta \to 0^+$ we get (6.14).

This ends the proof. □

We give now a complement of Theorem 6.5, which follows immediately from Theorem 6.1.

Proposition 6.6. *If* $\lambda_0 \notin K_\infty(f)$ *and there exists a meromorphic curve such that* $\deg(f-\lambda_0)\circ\Phi < 0$ *and* $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi = -\deg \Phi$ *then*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) = -1.$$

□

Before we pose questions concerning $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ for $n > 2$ we return to the Rabier's example.

Example 6.7. *For the Rabier's polynomial we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f^R) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f^R) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{for } \lambda = 0, \\ -1 & \text{for } \lambda \neq 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.17}$$

Indeed, for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ *and* $\Phi_\lambda(t) := (t, 1/2t, -4\lambda t)$ *we have* $f^R \circ \Phi_\lambda(t) \equiv \lambda$ *and* $\deg \nabla f \circ \Phi_\lambda = -\deg \Phi_\lambda$. *Hence and from Proposition 6.6 we get (6.17).*

□

This example gives rise to the question: can one generalize Theorems 5.1 and 4.6 to the n dimensional case? Precisely

Question 6.8. *Does the equality*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$$

hold for any non-constant polynomial $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, $n > 2$, *and* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$?

□

Question 6.9. *Does for a non-constant polynomial* $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, $n > 2$, *there exists a number* $c_f \in [-1, \infty)$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) = c_f \qquad \text{for any } \lambda \notin K_\infty(f)?$$

□

Remark 6.10. *It is known for* $n = 2$ *(see i.e.* [S]*) that* $\Lambda(f) = K_\infty(f)$. *Then the answers to both Problems 6.8 and 6.9 are positive. Moreover, by Theorem 4.6 the constant* c_f *belongs to the interval* $[0, \infty)$.

For $n > 2$ *we have only the inclusion* $\Lambda(f) \subset K_\infty(f)$ *(see* [P]*). In general the equality does not hold. One can show that for the polynomial* $f^{PZ}(x,y,z) := x - 3x^5y^2 + 2x^7y^3 + yz$ *(see* [PZ]*) we have*

$$\emptyset = \Lambda(f^{PZ}) \subsetneq K_\infty(f^{PZ}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Therefore by (6.3) it seems to be more natural in the case $n > 2$ *to consider the dependence of the exponents* $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ *and* $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f)$ *on* $K_\infty(f)$ *and not on* $\Lambda(f)$.

□

Let us introduce one more definition. A non-constant polynomial $f : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$, $n \geqslant 2$, is said to satisfy the Fedorjuk condition for a value $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ if

$$\exists_{\eta_0,\delta_0,R_0>0}\forall_{p\in\mathbb{C}^n}(|p| > R_0 \ \wedge \ |f(p) - \lambda_0| < \delta_0 \ \Rightarrow \ |\nabla f(p)| > \eta_0). \tag{6.18}$$

By $\widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$ we denote the set of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ for which the Fedorjuk condition does not hold. It is easy to check that $\lambda \in \widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$ if and only if there exists a sequence $\{p_k\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} |p_k| = \infty, \ \lim_{k\to\infty} f(p_k) = \lambda, \text{ and } \lim_{k\to\infty} |\nabla f(p_k)| = 0. \tag{6.19}$$

It is known (see [S]) that $\widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$ is algebraic. Then we have two excluded possibilities

$$\#\widetilde{K}_\infty(f) < +\infty \ \text{ or } \ \widetilde{K}_\infty(f) = \mathbb{C}. \tag{6.20}$$

Analogously to Theorem 6.1 we show

Theorem 6.11. *If $\widetilde{K}_\infty(f) \neq \mathbb{C}$ then for $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\lambda_0 \in \widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$,
(ii) $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < 0$,
(iii) $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda_0}(f) < 0$.

□

Remark 6.12. *The inclusion $K_\infty(f) \subset \widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$ is obvious. For $n = 2$ we have $K_\infty(f) = \widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$ and thus $\widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$ is finite. For $n > 2$ the equality $K_\infty(f) = \widetilde{K}_\infty(f)$ does not have to hold. Namely, from Example 6.7 and Theorem 6.11 we have $\widetilde{K}_\infty(f^R) = \mathbb{C}$ whereas $K_\infty(f^R)$ is finite.*

□

Question 6.13. *Does the equality $\widetilde{K}_\infty(f) = \mathbb{C}$ imply that $\mathcal{L}_{\infty,\lambda}(f) < 0$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$?*

□

REFERENCES

[CK1] Chądzyński, J. and Krasiński, T.: *Exponent of growth of polynomial mappings of $\mathbb{C}^2$ into $\mathbb{C}^2$*. In: Singularities. Banach Center Publ. 20, 147-160, PWN, Warszawa 1988.

[CK2] Chądzyński, J. and Krasiński, T.: *Sur l'exposant de Łojasiewicz à l'infini pour les applications polynomiales de $\mathbb{C}^2$ dans $\mathbb{C}^2$ et les composantes des automorphismes polynomiaux de $\mathbb{C}^2$*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I, 315(1992), 1399-1402.

[CK3] Chądzyński, J. and Krasiński, T.: *On the Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity for polynomial mappings of $\mathbb{C}^2$ into $\mathbb{C}^2$ and components of polynomial automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}^2$*. Ann. Polon. Math. 57(1992), 291-302.

[CK4] Chądzyński, J. and Krasiński, T.: *A set on which the Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity is attained.* Ann. Polon. Math. 67(1997), 191-197.

[F] Fedorjuk, M. V.: *The asymptotics of the Fourier transform of the exponential function of a polynomial.* Dokl. Akad. Nauk 227(1976), 580-583 (in Russian); english transl. in Soviet Math. Dokl. (2)17(1976), 486-490.

[GP] Gwoździewicz, J. and Płoski, A.: *Formulae for the singularities at infinity of plane algebraic curves.* Univ. Iagel. Acta Math.39(2001), 109-133.

[H1] Ha, H. V.: *Sur la fibration globale des polynômes de deux variables complexes.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I, 309(1989), 231-234.

[H2] Ha, H. V.: *Nombres de Łojasiewicz et singularitiés à l'infini des polynômes de deux variables complexes.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I, 311(1990), 429-432.

[JK] Jelonek, Z. and Kurdyka, K.: *On asymptotic critical values of a complex polynomial.* Preprint nr 614b (2001), Institute of Mathematics of the Polish Academy of Sciences.

[K] Krasiński, T.: *The level sets of polynomials in two variables and jacobian hypothesis.* Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź 1991. (in Polish).

[KL] Kuo, T. C. and Lu Y. C.:*On analytic function germs of two complex variables.* Topology 16(1977), 299-310.

[P] Parusiński, A.: *On the bifurcation set of complex polynomial with isolated singularities at infinity.* Compos. Math. 97(1995), 369-384.

[PZ] Păunescu, L. and Zaharia, A.:*On the Łojasiewicz exponent at infinity for polynomial functions.* Kodai Math. J. 20(1997), 269-274.

[Ph] Pham F.: *Vanishing homologies and the n-variables saddlepoint method.* Proc. Symposia Pure Math. 40, Part 2 (1983), 319-333.

[P1] Płoski, A.: *Polar quotients and singularities at infinity of polynomials in two complex variables.* Ann. Polon. Math. (to appear). Preprint no 2001/04. Institute of Mathematics of the Iagiellonian University in Cracow (http://www.im.uj.edu.pl).

[P2] Płoski, A.: *On the maximal polar quotient of an analytic plane curve.* Kodai Math. J. 24(2001), 120-133.

[R] Rabier, *Ehresmann's fibrations and Palais-Smale conditions for morphisms of Finsler manifolds.* Annals of Math. 146(1997), 647-691.

[Ro] Rodak, T.: *Łojasiewicz exponent for formal mappings.* Preprint no 2002/04. Faculty of Mathematics of the University of Łódź (http://imul.uni.lodz.pl/preprints).

[S] Spodzieja, S.: *Łojasiewicz inequalities at infinity for the gradient of a polynomial.* Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math. (to appear). Preprint no 2001/08. Faculty of Mathematics of the University of Łódź (http://imul.uni.lodz.pl/preprints).

[V] Verdier J.L.: *Stratifications de Whitney et théorème de Bertini-Sard.* Invent. Math. 36 (1976), 295-312.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ŁÓDŹ, 90-238 ŁÓDŹ, POLAND
E-mail address: `jachadzy@math.uni.lodz.pl`

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ŁÓDŹ, 90-238 ŁÓDŹ, POLAND
E-mail address: `krasinsk@krysia.uni.lodz.pl`